

## Restoration- Statewide Restoration Oversight (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700608

### A. List of Restoration Activities

The BLM is particularly interested in advancing technologies for aridland restoration and learning from outcomes of restoration projects funded by the OHMVR Division. Restoration of desert riparian areas damaged by OHV travel is a major direction for restoration on BLM public lands in the coming years. Efficiencies in seed collection, plant propagation, drought resilience, and herbivore control can help the BLM respond to the scale of OHV restoration required to meet OHMVR conservation standards for OHV recreation landscapes.

To advance planning, technical transfer, and learning among BLM staff working on OHV restoration projects, the BLM will undertake the following six restoration activities for 2010/2011:

1. Work with the seven BLM Field Office staffs in the California Desert District and the Colorado River District to prepare a strategic landscape-wide vision and timeline of restoration projects on OHV-impacted lands based on principals of landscape ecology and the demand for sustainable opportunities for OHV travel and riding recreation.
2. Expand partnerships with tribal and local plant nurseries to produce stocks of plants and seeds with genetic material specifically collected from BLM lands near OHV-impacted lands.
3. Develop priorities at the BLM California Desert District for riparian restoration to repair OHV-damaged sites in the context of watersheds. This effort will require collaboration with the San Bernardino and Sequoia National Forests, the Mojave National Preserve, Joshua Tree and Death Valley National Parks, Anza-Borrego State Park, and Ocotillo SVRA.
4. Assist BLM field office staffs in preparing long-range prescriptions for vegetation management in restoration projects for grants received from the OHMVR Division.
5. Compile, map, and annotate restoration areas from Jawbone-Butterbrecht ACEC and the Yuha Desert/Flat-tailed Horned Lizard ACEC in the BLM GIS as a tool to integrate and review OHV management to make decisions on future projects to restore ecosystem function, visual quality, and riding experience.
6. Assist BLM field office staffs in expanding monitoring and facilitating database management to store environmental information related to restoration projects funded by the OHMVR Division trust funds.

All work in this grant project will occur during the federal fiscal year from October 2010 through September 2011.

### B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

The proposed project responds to the need for capacity building and technical information at the Bureau of Land Management to meet the challenge from the OHMVR to restore aridland landscapes to natural conditions where unauthorized OHV travel and recreation have impacted environmental functions. Through strategic decision making and collaboration in a broader network of partnerships in desert watersheds and across jurisdictional boundaries, this project plans for resilient and healthy landscapes in the long-term where OHV recreation takes place.

Efficiency is a major consideration to ensure that the OHMVR restoration grant funds are applied to their greatest effect. With a focus on monitoring as a tool for evaluating and perfecting restoration techniques, the Bureau sets itself on a course of continuous improvement in the skills and knowledge of its restoration practitioners.

### C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles

The geographic scope of this grant application covers the public lands open to OHV riding in the BLM California Desert District and in the California portion of the BLM Colorado River District. The total acreage of these public lands is 10.9 million acres. The map attached to this grant application shows the locations of two major restoration projects undertaken now for the longest time by the BLM with grant funding from the OHMVR Division: the Yuha Desert ACEC and the Jawbone-Butterbrecht ACEC (exclusive of open riding areas and wilderness). Refer to Map 1.

The BLM will identify specific areas for riparian restoration in FY 2011. Priority riparian sites for future OHMVR funding will be where either designated or unauthorized OHV trails are directly intersecting desert riparian areas. Refer to Map 2.

#### **D. Monitoring and Methodology**

The Bureau of Land Management conducts two kinds of monitoring at its restoration sites. For compliance monitoring, the Bureau staff or its contractors create a record of sites photographed before and after each restoration action. These photographs are filed with spatial links in the BLM GIS to restoration work sites. Park rangers and law enforcement officers monitor restoration sites after their initial treatment to detect whether motorized intrusions are undermining the restoration work and report their findings to the BLM restoration coordinator.

To learn about the effectiveness of the vegetation treatments employed at a specific site, the Bureau is increasing its quantitative evaluation of restoration results. Thus far, the Bureau has been revisiting sites one-year and five-years later to chronicle progress and needs for re-treatment.

Monitoring protocols differ among restoration sites but follow in general those established in the publication Measuring and Monitoring Plant Populations (1998). Randomized, linear sampling is used for trails. Randomized long and narrow quadrats are used to sample vegetation over large acreages being restored. Stratification is part of monitoring sampling when the restoration site contains more than one vegetation type.

#### **E. List of Reports**

The BLM will provide an annual report of tasks accomplished, a photographic library, monitoring data, and geodatabases of restoration spatial data from the BLM California Desert District and the BLM Colorado River District. A summary of findings from retrospective monitoring of restoration projects in the Yuha Desert ACEC and the Jawbone-Butterbrecht ACEC plus a strategic plans for each field office for OHV-recreation related restoration will come from this effort.

#### **F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews**

#### **G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area**

Plans for to protect restored areas differ among sites across the BLM California Desert District and the BLM Colorado River District. Details of the protection plans are provided with each individual grant application for a restoration project. This grant includes as a product an examination of the effectiveness of protection measures by evaluating outcomes at restoration sites.

In general protection take two forms:

- 1) restoration design measures to protect sites by naturally camouflaging them or by erecting fences or other barriers such as rice straw bales; and
- 2) surveillance by park rangers, law enforcement officers, and the public.

## Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700608

**1. Project-Specific Maps**

Attachments:

[Restoration Review Areas 2011](#)

[Prospective Riparian Restoration Sites in the CDCA 2011](#)

**2. Project-Specific Photos**

Attachments:

[Jawbone Before and After Restoration Photos](#)

[Yuha Desert Example 1 Before Restoration](#)

[Yuha Desert Example 1 After Restoration](#)

[Yuha Desert Example 2 Before Restoration](#)

[Yuha Desert Example 2 After Restoration](#)

## Project Cost Estimate

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
<b>APPLICANT NAME :</b>	BLM - California State Office		
<b>PROJECT TITLE :</b>	Restoration- Statewide Restoration Oversight (FINAL)	<b>PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :</b>	G09-01-07-R01
<b>PROJECT TYPE :</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION :</b>	<p>The BLM is particularly interested in advancing technologies for aridland restoration and learning from outcomes of restoration projects funded by the OHMVR Division. Restoration of desert riparian areas damaged by OHV travel is a major direction for restoration on BLM public lands in the coming years. Efficiencies in seed collection, plant propagation, drought resilience, and herbivore control can help the BLM respond to the scale of OHV restoration required to meet OHMVR conservation standards for OHV recreation landscapes.</p> <p>To advance planning, technical transfer, and learning among BLM staff working on OHV restoration projects, the BLM will undertake the following six restoration activities for 2010/2011:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Work with the seven BLM Field Office staffs in the California Desert District and the Colorado River District to prepare a strategic landscape-wide vision and timeline of restoration projects on OHV-impacted lands based on principals of landscape ecology and the demand for sustainable opportunities for OHV travel and riding recreation.</li> <li>2. Expand partnerships with tribal and local plant nurseries to produce stocks of plants and seeds with genetic material specifically collected from BLM lands near OHV-impacted lands.</li> <li>3. Develop priorities at the BLM California Desert District for riparian restoration to repair OHV-damaged sites in the context of watersheds. This effort will require collaboration with the San Bernardino and Sequoia National Forests, the Mojave National Preserve, Joshua Tree and Death Valley National Parks, Anza-Borrego State Park, and Ocotillo SVRA.</li> <li>4. Assist BLM field office staffs in preparing long-range prescriptions for vegetation management in restoration projects for grants received from the OHMVR Division.</li> <li>5. Compile, map, and annotate restoration areas from Jawbone-Butterbrecht ACEC and the Yuha Desert/Flat-tailed Horned Lizard ACEC in the BLM GIS as a tool to integrate and review OHV management to make decisions on future projects to restore ecosystem function, visual quality, and riding experience.</li> <li>6. Assist BLM field office staffs in expanding monitoring and facilitating database management to store environmental information related to restoration projects funded by the OHMVR Division trust funds.</li> </ol> <p>All work in this grant project will occur during the federal fiscal year from October 2010 through September 2011.</p>		

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: BLM - California State Office  
Application: Restoration- Statewide Restoration Oversight (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>							
<b>Program Expenses</b>							
<b>1</b>	<b>Staff</b>						
	Ecologist	520.000	72.300	HRS	37,596.00	0.00	37,596.00
	OHV Coordinator	305.000	79.440	HRS	0.00	24,229.00	24,229.00
	Park Ranger	70.000	45.000	HRS	0.00	3,150.00	3,150.00
	Recreation Planner	140.000	58.850	HRS	0.00	8,239.00	8,239.00
	Other-GIS Specialist	80.000	58.850	HRS	0.00	4,708.00	4,708.00
	<b>Total for Staff</b>				37,596.00	40,326.00	77,922.00
<b>2</b>	<b>Contracts</b>						
<b>3</b>	<b>Materials / Supplies</b>						
<b>4</b>	<b>Equipment Use Expenses</b>						
	4x4 Vehicle	4000.000	0.500	MI	0.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
<b>5</b>	<b>Equipment Purchases</b>						
<b>6</b>	<b>Others</b>						
	Other-Travel	4.000	350.000	EA	1,400.00	0.00	1,400.00
	Other-Lodging	28.000	85.000	DAY	1,190.00	1,190.00	2,380.00
	<b>Total for Others</b>				2,590.00	1,190.00	3,780.00
<b>7</b>	<b>Indirect Costs</b>						
	Indirect Costs-Accounting and Contractin	37596.00 0	0.100	EA	0.00	3,760.00	3,760.00
<b>Total Program Expenses</b>					40,186.00	47,276.00	87,462.00
<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>					40,186.00	47,276.00	87,462.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: BLM - California State Office  
Application: Restoration- Statewide Restoration Oversight (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					40,186.00	47,276.00	87,462.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
 Agency: BLM - California State Office  
 Application: Restoration- Statewide Restoration Oversight (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>					
<b>Program Expenses</b>					
1	Staff	37,596.00	40,326.00	77,922.00	<p>The BLM Ecologist will be the principal employee responsible for accomplishing the tasks outlined in the Project Description.</p> <p>Staff at seven BLM field offices will contribute their time to the grant project in the following ways:</p> <p>The statewide BLM OHV Coordinator oversees the fiscal aspect of managing all restoration grants in the California Desert District as part of his programmatic duties. Restoration projects require approximately 15 percent of his time.</p> <p>Park rangers at seven BLM field offices will contribute on average 10 hours annually to assist the Ecologist in evaluating the effectiveness of restoration protection plans.</p> <p>BLM Recreation planners and restoration specialists at seven BLM field offices will contribute on average 20 hours annually to assist the Ecologist in prioritizing restoration sites and a timeline for the OHV restoration strategy.</p> <p>The BLM GIS specialist at the California State Office will assist in assembling and validating restoration polygons of OHMVR restoration proj</p>
2	Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: BLM - California State Office  
Application: Restoration- Statewide Restoration Oversight (FINAL)

3/1/2010

3	Materials / Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	The BLM will cover the vehicle expenses for travel of its employees for implementing this grant. The mileage figure presented here is likely to be underestimated.
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	2,590.00	1,190.00	3,780.00	These elements cover partially the travel (air only, not motor vehicle) and lodging costs. The BLM will make every effort to keep the use of air travel and lodging to a minimum cost. Note this request does not request "per diem" funds.
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	3,760.00	3,760.00	
<b>Total Program Expenses</b>		40,186.00	47,276.00	87,462.00	
<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>		40,186.00	47,276.00	87,462.00	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>		<b>40,186.00</b>	<b>47,276.00</b>	<b>87,462.00</b>	



## Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700608

### ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

#### ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)

#### ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

### ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

The actions under this grant application consist of retrospective monitoring to examine the effectiveness of recent restoration projects supported by OHMVR trust funds in the Yuha Desert ACEC and the Jawbone-Butterbrecht ACEC. Monitoring of this kind is non-destructive and will not cause, by itself, any physical impacts on the environment at the restoration site environments being examined.

The second part of the grant application consists of prioritizing riparian restoration projects and preparing the NEPA documentation for engineering (operational) solutions to alter trail pathways to avoid further impacts to riparian areas due to OHV travel and recreational riding AND for restoration solutions to recover lost vegetation and hydrologic flow and function at trail-impacted sites.

There are no impacts to wetlands from monitoring and restoration/operations project planning occurring under this grant request.

### ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

### ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

### ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

### ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

### ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

**ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources**

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☐ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

**ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts**

**CEQA/NEPA Attachment**

Attachments:

[CASO Restoration Oversight CA 05 03 10](#)

## Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700608

### 1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 5

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)  
☒ 51% - 75% (5 points)  
☐ 26% - 50% (3 points)  
☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

### 2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 14

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Domestic water supply (4 points)  
☒ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points )  
☒ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)  
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)  
☒ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [riparian areas on BLM lands along the Colorado River, critical desert tortoise h]  
☒ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species [3]  
☐ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

Restoring native vegetation along streams can better protect historic sites (eg: World War II military installations) and spring sites with archaeological resources.

Watershed planning across agency boundaries for OHV-related restoration will ensure that actions to restore streams and watercourses in watersheds are consistent and mutually reinforcing.

Evaluation of soils for erosion problems will be undertaken in the focal areas for FY 2011. Restoration prescriptions will include remediation for soils at restoration sites.

Sensitive riparian lands on BLM lands along the Lower Colorado River are a focus for restoring damage created by unauthorized OHV travel. These riparian lands are habitat for numerous T&E (Yellow-billed Cuckoo, Gila Woodpecker) and CA Fish and Game species of concern (Crissal Thrasher, Vermilion Flycatcher, Yellow-breasted Chat). Managing OHV travel and curbing damage to riparian vegetation on its public lands along the Colorado River is a BLM wildlife conservation priority.

### 3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)

- ☒ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
- ☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
- ☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
- ☐ Management decision (1 point)
- ☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
- ☐ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

The North and East Colorado Desert Amendments to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, 2002  
The North and East Mojave Desert Amendments to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, 2002  
The Coachella Valley Plan Amendments to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, 2002  
The West Mojave Plan Amendments to the California Desert Conservation Plan, 2006  
The Western Colorado Desert Route Designation Amendments to the California Desert Conservation Plan, 2003  
The Eastern San Diego County Resource Management Plan Amendments to the California Desert Conservation Plan, 2008  
The BLM Yuma District Resource Management Plan 1986 (now being updated)

**4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.**

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 8

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☐ Educational signage
- ☐ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

One emphasis of this grant application involves support to the BLM field offices for increasing site monitoring, advancing techniques to control unauthorized traffic onto restoration project sites, and expanding the propagation capacity with native plants for BLM restoration projects funded by the OHMVR Division. Barriers may consist variously of partially buried boulders, haybales, fencing, gating, and visual camouflage to reduce unauthorized riding on sites undergoing restoration. Barrier design using principals of landscape architecture and materials able to withstand harsh desert conditions will ensure greater success at protecting restoration sites. The BLM will apply the Best Management Practices for water quality established by the US Forest Service, Region 5, in 2000 for its restoration projects funded by the OHMVR trust funds.

**5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.**

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

The Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Plan, 2005  
The North and East Colorado Desert Amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, 2002  
The North and East Mojave Desert Amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, 2002  
The Coachella Valley Plan Amendments to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, 2002  
The West Mojave Route Designation Amendment to the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, 2006

**6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.**

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)  
☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)  
☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)  
☒ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

**7. Public Input - Q 7.**

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 1

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)  
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)  
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The California State Ecologist met with staff from the OHMVR Division, the US Forest Service, and the BLM California leadership to identify areas in need of support to expand restoration operations for aridlands on public lands in California.

**8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.**

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)  
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Joshua Tree National Park Nursery  
Student Conservation Association  
tribal nurseries in the lower Colorado River region  
US Forest Service, Region 5

**9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.**

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)  
☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)  
☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)  
☐ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

**10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.**

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ No (No points)

☐ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

**11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.**

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)

☐ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)

☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)

☐ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)